

O

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHARLES DAVID HENRY,
Petitioner,

v.

JACK L. ALLBRITTON,
Respondent.

Case No. LA CV 15-9711 DDP (JCG)

**ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING
ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND
DENYING CERTIFICATE OF
APPEALABILITY**

On December 17, 2015, petitioner Charles David Henry (“Petitioner”), a California prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Petition”). [Dkt. No. 1.] Notably, it is his second federal petition challenging a 2005 state court judgment of conviction and sentence. (*See* Pet. at 2, 4.) Thus, the Court finds that the Petition is an unauthorized “second or successive” petition, and summarily dismisses this action without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. 2244(b).

By way of background, Petitioner first challenged his conviction and sentence in 2008 (“2008 Petition”). (Pet. at 4.) The 2008 Petition was denied. [*See* C.D. Cal. Case No. LA CV 08-0418 DDP (RZ), Dkt. Nos. 46, 58, 59.] Petitioner’s subsequent request for a certificate of appealability was also denied. [*Id.*, Dkt. No. 68.]

1 Now, in the instant Petition, Petitioner seeks to challenge the *same* 2005
 2 judgment of conviction and sentence.¹ (Pet. at 2.) However, Petitioner has failed to
 3 obtain the Ninth Circuit's authorization to file a "second or successive" petition. *See*
 4 28 U.S.C. 2244(b). Thus, the Petition is an unauthorized "second or successive"
 5 petition, and the Court must dismiss this action for lack of jurisdiction. *See id.*

6 Moreover, and in any event, Petitioner's claim regarding the California
 7 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's failure to invoke the "recall of
 8 commitment" procedure is not cognizable on federal habeas review. (*See* Pet. at 11-
 9 43); *see also, e.g., Harris v. Valenzuela*, 2014 WL 4988150, at *5 (C. D. Cal. Oct. 7,
 10 2014) ("Given the permissive nature of California's recall of commitment procedure
 11 and the wealth of California decisions holding that California prisoners have no state
 12 law right to seek enforcement of that procedure, there is no basis for finding that
 13 Section 1170(d) gives rise to a liberty interest enforceable as a matter of federal due
 14 process.") (citation omitted); *Harris v. S.C.*, 2014 WL 2611386, at *5 (C.D. Cal. June
 15 11, 2014) (same).

16 For the foregoing reasons, **IT IS ORDERED THAT** this action be
 17 **SUMMARILY DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for lack of jurisdiction,
 18 pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States
 19 District Courts.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ¹ Even though the Petition challenges Petitioner's sentence and not his conviction, both
 27 originate from the same *judgment* as the 2008 Petition. *See Burton v. Stewart*, 549 U.S. 147, 156-57
 28 (2007) (holding that a "judgment" challenged under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 comprises a state court
 conviction and sentence).

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability be **DENIED**
2 because Petitioner has not shown that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether
3 this Court was correct in its procedural ruling. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473,
4 484 (2000).

5 **LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

6
7 DATED: February 10, 2016

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Dean D. Pregerson", is written over a horizontal line.

8 HON. DEAN D. PREGERSON
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28